

**AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWING(S)**

Figs. 1-3 have been amended. The attached sheets of formal drawings replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-3.

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The suggestion that in order to claim priority, Applicant must amend the specification to claim that priority, is noted but believed to be in error. This non-provisional application is not based on an International application but rather makes a priority claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). As noted in MPEP 201.14(b):

The claim for priority may appear in the oath or declaration, an application data sheet or the application transmittal letter with the recitation of the foreign application. MPEP 201.13 II. A

This is not a U.S. application based upon an International application, covered *inter alia* by MPEP 201.11 III. D. On the other hand, if a reference to the priority application is required in the specification, the undersigned would appreciate identification of the section of the Manual stating that requirement.

The drawing were objected to for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Replacement sheets for drawing Figures 1-3 are enclosed in which written word legends appear, as was required. Further, the drawings were objected to as being of insufficient quality to permit examination. It is submitted that the replacement sheets are sufficient. The requirement for a two-month period for submitting the replacement drawings is noted. They are submitted with this response. A one-month extension is requested along with this response for filing the drawing sheets.

The specification was objected to because the states and steps of the claimed invention were not sufficiently clear. With the amendments to the drawings giving names to the numbered elements in the specification, it is submitted that the states and steps of the claimed invention are clear.

The original claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Willens. Reconsideration is requested. Applicant's independent claims 1 and 7 include a distinguishing element: in claim 1 "identifying a user profile at least by an information pertaining to the age of the user"; and in claim 7 "means for identifying a user profile at least by an information pertaining to the age of the user to identify the user as a minor or not."

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Willens teaches a method of using stored user profiles to determine if the user is a minor, but the Examiner does not cite to a passage in Willens suggesting using the stored profile to determine if the user is a minor in order to allow or deny access to restricted web sites. Claims 1 and 7 describe a method and a device that allows initial distinguishing between an adult and a minor, both at the connection phase and in the implementation by permitting access to a non-minor user and permitting access with a controlled navigation step for a minor user. The initial connection is further subdivided by the identification of the user profile between an adult profile and a minor profile.

In Willens, when a user logs onto the Internet, a user profile is attributed to the user and the user profile is filtered. The server has a list of sites to which access is permitted and to which it is to be denied. This list may be downloaded. There is no initial identification of user profile by at least information pertaining to the age of the user, so that no determination is made in Willens as whether the user is a minor or not a minor and following identifying a minor, there is no controlled navigation step for accessing the network. The invention is based on the principle of identifying the user and distinguishing between an adult and a minor, which the Willens disclosure does not suggest.

With regard to claims 2 and 3-5, the above comments as to claim 1 apply.

As to claims 3-5, Willens does not disclose the presence of an accessibility key suitable to identify the site as accessible to the minor user and the converse of a non-accessibility key suitable to identify the site as non-accessible to the minor user. No presence or use of a key is suggested.

Further, with respect to claim 4, the two steps of first seeing whether there is an accessibility key and then checking for the presence of keywords is not suggested in Willens.

Hence, claims 3-5 are allowable.

Claim 6 was rejected over a combination of Willens and Walker because Walker is said to teach preparation of report of the navigation performed by the user and sending it to the parent of a minor user. Reconsideration is requested. Neither Willens nor Walker shows or suggests the features of claims 1 and 7 discussed above.

Further, while claim 6 specifically requires preparing the report of the navigation and sending the report to the parents of the minor user, the passage in Walker cited does not describe preparing a report nor delivering a report to a parent. There is no indication in Walker that navigation is reported on or that a report of the navigation is provided. The report indicated is of time or time between two events, not what was viewed and no report of what was viewed by a minor. Claim 6 is thus distinguishable from the prior art.

In conclusion, all of claims 1-7, as amended are allowable and their allowance is requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 22, 2004:

December 22, 2004

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

*Robert C. Faber*

Signature

December 22, 2004

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert C. Faber*

Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:mjb